

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 28-39 were previously pending. In the current responsive amendment, claims 28 and 34 have been amended and claims 40 and 41 have been added. Therefore, claims 28-41 are currently pending. No new matter has been presented.

Reconsideration of the patentability of the claimed subject matter is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following discussion.

§ 102 Rejection

Claims 28-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Multer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,671,757 (*'Multer'*). It is submitted that *Multer* does not disclose (or even suggest) the subject matter of claims 28-39 for the following reasons.

Independent claim 28, as amended, recites the step of passing user identification information regarding the electronic device to the content server via the conduits, and also recites that newer versions of the applications are ***personalized for the electronic device*** based on the user identification information. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in the text from page 32, line 18 to page 34, line 11 of Applicant's specification.

The *Multer* reference is silent with regard to providing user information for an electronic device to a server which the server uses to present new versions of personalized applications for the electronic device. While *Multer* briefly states that each device engine is known to the management server and that this "allows for tailoring behavior between the management server and specific types of storage systems and device engine components" (*Multer*, col. 33, lines 8-10), this "tailoring" concerns making sure a selected device is being synchronized and/or setting whether a particular application requires a synchronization (see *Multer*, col. 35, lines 23-65), and does not concern directing a content server to provide personalized content based on user identification information.

It is accordingly submitted that *Multer* does not anticipate the subject matter of amended claim 28 or its dependent claims 29-33.

Independent claim 34, as amended, recites subject matter analogous to that of claim 28. Therefore claim 34 and its dependent claims 35-39 are also not anticipated by *Multer* for at least the same reasons as given for claim 28.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 28-39 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is accordingly respectfully requested.

New claims 40 and 41 depend from claims 28 and 34, respectively, and are patentable for same reasons given with respect to their base claims.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly addressed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding rejections. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 12, 2008

By: /Howard Grossman/

Reg. No. 48,673

Phone: 212-871-6266

Correspondence Address

Cust. No. 49637

Berry & Associates, P.C.

9255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 810

Los Angeles, CA 90069

Phone: (310) 247-2860

Fax: (310) 247-2864